

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**DONALD EARL COLLINS,  
ID # 1628695,**

**Petitioner,**

**vs.**

**RICK THALER, Director,  
Texas Department of Criminal  
Justice, Correctional Institutions Division,  
Respondent.**

**No. 3:11-CV-1404-P (BH)**

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and any objections thereto, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court is of the opinion that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court. Petitioner's objection to the Magistrate Judge's Findings filed on July 27, 2011 indicate petitioner sought and was denied relief from TDCJ. However, petitioner has not filed another state habeas claim on this issue as stated by the Magistrate Judge. Thus, petitioner has still not exhausted his state remedies because the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has not had the opportunity to rule on petitioner's claims on the merits. For the reasons stated in the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, the petition for habeas corpus is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to exhaust state remedies.

In accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) and after considering the record in this case and the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, petitioner is **DENIED** a Certificate of Appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate

Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation in support of its finding that the petitioner has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).<sup>1</sup>

If petitioner files a notice of appeal, he must pay the \$455.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and a properly signed certificate of inmate trust account.

SIGNED this 2nd day of August, 2011.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 Cases, as amended effective on December 1, 2009, reads as follows:

**(a) Certificate of Appealability.** The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22. A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

**(b) Time to Appeal.** Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability.